

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to applicant's argument that Silverbrook's coded data are distinct from applicant's pattern marking, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant alleges that Silverbrook's teaching of coded data in tags is different form applicant's teaching of patterns. The purpose of Silverbrook's coded data as a collection of tags is to track edits in a document by determining the location of the pen, Column 39, lines 59-67. According to applicant's specification the pattern is defined as being markings on a sheet that help determine position on a sheet in relation to the markings. This is the same thing as Silverbrook's coded data. Since there is no clear difference stated in the claim as to the difference between the pattern markings and Silverbrook's coded data, then Silverbrook's coded data is similar to the pattern markings. The pattern marking are only claimed as an element on a document other then the content, wherein the specification describes the pattern markings as being able to determine the location on the document. Therefore, the coded data of Silverbrook is the same as applicant's pattern markings.

2. In regards to applicants argument that "Lapstun is silent on modifying the shape or location of the at least one functional area," the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner notes that the functional area of the document is the area in which the document is printed on. Lapstun discusses modifying the area that is printed with the tags in relation to the orientation of the page. By changing the orientation of the page,

this is changing the location of the tags. The tags are known in relation to the x and y axis of the paper. By changing the orientation of the page, the dimensions of the x and y axis change. This would be changing the location of where the tags are printed, the functional area. Therefore, Lapstun does teach " modifying the shape or location of the at least one functional area.".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 16, 17, and 21-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverbrook (US 6,987,573) in view of Lapstun (US 7,070,098).

Regarding Claim 16, Silverbrook teaches a method of printing a digital document (Column 1, lines 5-13) comprising:

providing a first document for printing, the first document comprising at least one functional area wherein pattern markings are to be printed (Column 2, lines 3-5 and Column 4, line 66 - Column 5, line 6, wherein the document is prepared to be printed with the content and the coded data. Column 39, lines 59-67. According to applicant's specification the pattern is defined as being markings on a sheet that help determine position on a sheet in relation to the markings. This is the same thing as Silverbrook's

coded data. Since there is no clear difference stated in the claim as to the difference between the pattern markings and Silverbrook's coded data, then Silverbrook's coded data is similar to the pattern markings. The pattern marking are only claimed as an element on a document other then the content, wherein the specification describes the pattern markings as being able to determine the location on the document.);

generating from the first document a second document wherein at least one functional area is modified area (Figure 25, elements 836, 834 and Column 12, lines 10-42, wherein the first document is the original document and the second document is the formatted document. The formatted document is adjusted from the original document to print the document as desired by the user in regards to the user's preferences);

obtaining a portion of a pattern to fit the modified functional area (Figure 25, elements 836, 834 and Column 12, lines 10-42, wherein the first document is the original document and the second document is the formatted document. The formatted document is adjusted from the original document to print the document as desired by the user in regards to the user's preferences); and

printing the second document (Column 14, lines 15-17).

Silverbrook does not teach wherein at least one of the shape or location of the at least one functional area is modified.

Lapstun does teach generating from the first document a second document wherein at least one of the shape or location of the at least one functional area is modified (Column 3, lines 49-54 and Column 62, lines 17-29, Lapstun discusses modifying the area that is printed with the tags in relation to the orientation of the page.

By changing the orientation of the page, this is changing the location of the tags. The tags are known in relation to the x and y axis of the paper. By changing the orientation of the page, the dimensions of the x and y axis change. This would be changing the location of where the tags are printed, the functional area.).

Silverbrook and Lapstun are combinable because they both deal with netpage printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook with the teachings of Lapstun for the purpose of being able to rotate the tags in the netpage (Lapstun: Column 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding Claim 17, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the first document includes some content (Column 12, lines 12-17, wherein the text and image objects are content).

Regarding Claim 21, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the step of obtaining the portion of the pattern for the functional area includes a step of requesting a portion of the pattern for the functional area from a pattern allocation device (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 22, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the amount of pattern requested and the identity of the portion of the pattern is determined according to the size of the modified functional area (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 23, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the step of requesting a portion of the pattern comprises requesting an area of the pattern larger than that which is required for a functional area of a document and allocating a sub-portion to the functional area according to how it has been modified (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 24, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the step of requesting a portion of the pattern comprises requesting an area of the pattern larger than that which is required for a functional area of a document and allocating a sub-portion to the functional area according to how the functional area has been modified (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 25, Silverbrook does not teach wherein the step of generating from the first document the second document comprises rotating the functional area relative to the remainder of the document.

Lapstun does teach wherein the step of generating from the first document the second document comprises rotating the functional area relative to the remainder of the document (Column 3, lines 49-54 and Column 62, lines 17-29).

Silverbrook and Lapstun are combinable because they both deal with netpage printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook with the teachings of Lapstun for the purpose of being able to rotate the tags in the netpage (Lapstun: Column 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding Claim 26, Silverbrook teaches a digital document printing apparatus (Column 1, lines 5-13) comprising:

a print application which receives a first document for printing, the first document comprising at least one functional area wherein pattern markings are to be printed (Column 2, lines 3-5 and Column 4, line 66 - Column 5, line 6, wherein the document is prepared to be printed with the content and the coded data. Column 39, lines 59-67. According to applicant's specification the pattern is defined as being markings on a sheet that help determine position on a sheet in relation to the markings. This is the same thing as Silverbrook's coded data. Since there is no clear difference stated in the

claim as to the difference between the pattern markings and Silverbrook's coded data, then Silverbrook's coded data is similar to the pattern markings. The pattern marking are only claimed as an element on a document other then the content, wherein the specification describes the pattern markings as being able to determine the location on the document.);

a document generating means configured to generate from the first document a second document wherein the at least one functional area is modified (Figure 25, elements 836, 834 and Column 12, lines 10-42, wherein the first document is the original document and the second document is the formatted document. The formatted document is adjusted from the original document to print the document as desired by the user in regards to the user's preferences); and

a pattern allocation unit which is arranged to allocate a portion of a pattern to fit the modified functional area at the request of the print application (Column 14, lines 15-17).

Silverbrook does not teach wherein at least one of the shape or location of the at least one functional area is modified; and

wherein the print application allocates the portion of the pattern to the functional area according to the function area's shape or location.

Lapstun does teach generating from the first document a second document wherein at least one of the shape or location of the at least one functional area is modified (Column 3, lines 49-54 and Column 62, lines 17-29, Lapstun discusses modifying the area that is printed with the tags in relation to the orientation of the page.

By changing the orientation of the page, this is changing the location of the tags. The tags are known in relation to the x and y axis of the paper. By changing the orientation of the page, the dimensions of the x and y axis change. This would be changing the location of where the tags are printed, the functional area.).

wherein the print application allocates the portion of the pattern to the functional area according to the function area's shape or location (Column 62, lines 17-29).

Silverbrook and Lapstun are combinable because they both deal with netpage printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook with the teachings of Lapstun for the purpose of being able to rotate the tags in the netpage (Lapstun: Column 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding Claim 27, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the print application is arranged to generate a print file which comprises a set of instructions (Column 14, lines 15-17 and Column 47, lines 55-67)

Regarding Claim 28, Silverbrook further teaches further comprising a printer configured to print the second document together with the pattern markings (Column 14, lines 15-17).

Regarding Claim 29, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern allocation unit allocates a portion of the pattern that is larger than that which is required for a function area and the print application allocates a sub- portion of the portion of the pattern to the functional area (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 30, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern allocation unit allocates a portion of the pattern that is larger than that which is required for a function area and the print application allocates a sub- portion of the portion of the pattern to the functional area (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 31, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern allocation unit stores a set of identifiers which uniquely identify each of a set of first documents and allocates a unique portion of the pattern to each document (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 32, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern allocation unit stores a set of identifiers which uniquely identify each of a set of first documents

and allocates a unique portion of the pattern to each document (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 33, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern allocation unit stores a set of identifiers which uniquely identify each of a set of first documents and allocates a unique portion of the pattern to each document (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 34, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern allocation unit stores a set of identifiers which uniquely identify each of a set of first documents and allocates a unique portion of the pattern to each document (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating the a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 35, Silverbrook teaches a computer-readable medium with program code embodied therein for causing when executed, a computer system, to perform a method of (Column 1, line 5-13, wherein a program must be run in order for the apparatuses to function properly):

receiving a first document for printing, the first document comprising at least one functional area wherein pattern markings are to be printed (Column 2, lines 3-5 and

Column 4, line 66 - Column 5, line 6, wherein the document is prepared to be printed with the content and the coded data. Column 39, lines 59-67. According to applicant's specification the pattern is defined as being markings on a sheet that help determine position on a sheet in relation to the markings. This is the same thing as Silverbrook's coded data. Since there is no clear difference stated in the claim as to the difference between the pattern markings and Silverbrook's coded data, then Silverbrook's coded data is similar to the pattern markings. The pattern marking are only claimed as an element on a document other then the content, wherein the specification describes the pattern markings as being able to determine the location on the document.);

generating from the first document a second document wherein at least one functional area is modified (Figure 25, elements 836, 834 and Column 12, lines 10-42, wherein the first document is the original document and the second document is the formatted document. The formatted document is adjusted from the original document to print the document as desired by the user in regards to the user's preferences); and

requesting a portion of a pattern to fit the modified functional area from a source of the pattern (Column 14, lines 15-17).

Silverbrook does not teach wherein at least one of the shape or location of the at least one functional area is modified; and

allocating the portion of the pattern to the functional area according to the function area's shape or location.

Lapstun does teach generating from the first document a second document wherein at least one of the shape or location of the at least one functional area is

modified (Column 3, lines 49-54 and Column 62, lines 17-29, Lapstun discusses modifying the area that is printed with the tags in relation to the orientation of the page. By changing the orientation of the page, this is changing the location of the tags. The tags are known in relation to the x and y axis of the paper. By changing the orientation of the page, the dimensions of the x and y axis change. This would be changing the location of where the tags are printed, the functional area.);

allocating the portion of the pattern to the functional area according to the function area's shape or location (Column 62, lines 17-29).

Silverbrook and Lapstun are combinable because they both deal with netpage printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook with the teachings of Lapstun for the purpose of being able to rotate the tags in the netpage (Lapstun: Column 3, lines 49-54).

Regarding Claim 36, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the identity of the portion of the pattern comprises its location in a pattern space (Column 12, lines 28-42, wherein by allocating a different size, the pattern is then adjusted within the spatial extent or zone to be able to be properly formatted on the page).

Regarding Claim 37, Silverbrook further teaches wherein the pattern comprises position identifying background markings printed on a portion of a carrier (Column 7,

lines 43-48 and Column 39, lines 59-67, wherein the tags will identify the position of the marking on the page, carrier).

5. Claims 18-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverbrook (US 6,987,573) in view of Lapstun (US 7,070,098) further in view of Natori (US 2002/0175958).

Regarding Claim 18, Silverbrook in view of Lapstun does not teach wherein the step of generating from the first document the second document or obtaining the portion of the pattern for the functional area is performed by a print application.

Natori does teach wherein the step of generating from the first document the second document or obtaining the portion of the pattern for the functional area is performed by a print application (Page 2, paragraph 20 and Page 5, paragraph 61).

Silverbrook in view of Lapstun and Natori are combinable because they both deal with applying a pattern to a document for printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook in view of Lapstun with the teachings of Natori for the purpose of allowing the user to have control over modifying the document to their own preference (Natori: Page 5, paragraph 61).

Regarding Claim 19, Silverbrook in view of Lapstun does not teach wherein a printer driver presents to a user one or more prompts for the user to modify the first document.

Natori does teach wherein a printer driver presents to a user one or more prompts for the user to modify the first document (Page 2, paragraph 20 and Page 5, paragraph 61).

Silverbrook in view of Lapstun and Natori are combinable because they both deal with applying a pattern to a document for printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook in view of Lapstun with the teachings of Natori for the purpose of allowing the user to have control over modifying the document to their own preference (Natori: Page 5, paragraph 61).

Regarding Claim 20, Silverbrook in view of Lapstun does not wherein the step of generating from the first document the second document or obtaining the portion of the pattern for the functional area is performed by a print application.

Natori does teach wherein the step of generating from the first document the second document or obtaining the portion of the pattern for the functional area is performed by a print application (Page 2, paragraph 20 and Page 5, paragraph 61).

Silverbrook in view of Lapstun and Natori are combinable because they both deal with applying a pattern to a document for printing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Silverbrook in view of Lapstun with the teachings of Natori for the purpose of allowing the user to have control over modifying the document to their own preference (Natori: Page 5, paragraph 61).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS PACHOL whose telephone number is (571)270-3433. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/571,074  
Art Unit: 2625

Page 17

/N. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

08/24/11

/Twyler L. Haskins/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625